

United States
Department of
Agriculture



Food Assistance
and Nutrition
Research Report
Number 16-2

The Emergency Food Assistance System— Findings From the Provider Survey

Volume II: Final Report

James Ohls
Fazana Saleem-Ismail

Rhoda Cohen
Brenda Cox



Food Assistance
& Nutrition
Research Program

The Emergency Food Assistance System—Findings From the Provider Survey, Volume II: Final Report. By James Ohls, Fazana Saleem-Ismail, Rhoda Cohen, and Brenda Cox, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., for the Food and Rural Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report No. 16-2.

Abstract

Findings of the first comprehensive government study of the Emergency Food Assistance System (EFAS) suggest that public and private food assistance may work in tandem to provide more comprehensive food assistance than either could provide by itself. Five major types of organizations (emergency kitchens, food pantries, food banks, food rescue organizations, and emergency food organizations) operate in the EFAS. About 5,300 emergency kitchens provide more than 173 million meals a year, and 32,700 food pantries distribute about 2.9 billion pounds of food a year, which translates into roughly 2,200 million meals. Despite substantial amounts of food distributed by the system, the EFAS remains much smaller in scale than the Federal programs. This study, which was sponsored by USDA's Economic Research Service, provides detailed information about the system's operations and about each of the five types of organizations. This report presents the study results in detail. For a summary of the results, see *The Emergency Food Assistance System—Findings from the Provider Survey, Volume I: Executive Summary* at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr16-1>. For more information on the survey methodology, see *The Emergency Food Assistance System—Findings from the Provider Survey, Volume III: Survey Methodology* at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/efan01008>.

Keywords: Food pantry, emergency kitchen, food bank, food rescue organization, emergency food organization, TEFAP

This report was prepared by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., under a research contract from the Economic Research Service. The views expressed are those of Mathematica and not necessarily those of ERS or USDA.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Linda Kantor, the USDA project officer for most of the study, for her guidance, assistance, and flexibility. Valuable input has also been received from a number of other USDA staff members, including Laura Tiehen (the USDA project officer for the final stage of the study), David Smallwood, Margaret Andrews, Steven Carlson, Craig Gundersen, Bob DeLorenzo, Pat McKinney, Mark Nord, and Parke Wilde.

Important assistance in data collection was provided by Nancy Clusen and Daisy Ewell, who helped to design the sampling approach and drew the sample; Barbara Kolln, who supervised the computer programming for the telephone data collection; Jennifer McNeill, who programmed the instrument for computer-assistance telephone interviewing; Renee Harris and Tom Barton, who managed the actual survey operations; Kim Zito, who oversaw sample location activities; Bea Jones, who oversaw the development of the sampling frame; and Bharat Thakor, who developed the survey tracking computer system.

Larry Radbill made important contribution to the early design of the research and made many valuable suggestions in his role as the quality assurance reader for this report. Amy Zambrowski provided highly effective work in designing and implementing the file construction process, while Melynda Ihrig efficiently produced many rounds of SAS tabulations of the data. Julie Brys also helped with the programming at critical points.

Valuable suggestions about an earlier draft of the report were provided by Martha Burt, Ronette Briefel, Doug O'Brien, Lynn Parker, Barbara Cohen, and Brendan O'Flaherty.

Laura Berenson and Roy Grisham edited the entire manuscript, substantially improving its clarity. They were helped by Patricia Ciaccio. Additional valuable editorial support was provided by Courtney Knauth at USDA.

Jane Nelson provided extraordinary support in organizing the production of the manuscript of the report. She was assisted by Jill Miller, Cindy McClure, Marjorie Mitchell, Jennifer Baskwell, and Monica Capizzi-Linder.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Summary	v
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Objective of the Study	1
Description of the EFAS	2
Origins of the Current EFAS	6
Federal Assistance to the EFAS	7
Recent Research on the EFAS	8
Economic and Policy Context	11
Overview of Methods Used in Current Study	12
Chapter 2: Emergency Kitchens	13
Number of Kitchens and Meals They Serve Each Day	13
Characteristics of Emergency Kitchens	16
Meal Service Characteristics of Kitchens	25
Foods Used by Emergency Kitchens	33
Staffing and Other Resources	39
Chapter 3: Food Pantries	47
Number of Food Pantries	47
Characteristics of Food Pantries	50
Food Distribution Characteristics and Policies	59
Sources and Types of Foods Used by Food Pantries	65
Staffing and Other Resources	72
Chapter 4: Food Banks	79
Number of Food Banks	79
Characteristics of Food Banks	80
Food Distribution Characteristics and Policies	90
Sources and Types of Food Used by Food Banks	99
Resources	107
Chapter 5: Food Rescue Organizations	117
Basic Characteristics	117
Food Distribution Characteristics	120
Food Distribution Policies	123
Sources of Food Supplies	124
Food Supplies	126
Resources	129

Chapter 6: Interactions Between USDA Commodity Programs and the Emergency Food Assistance System	133
USDA Commodities as a Share of the Food Distributed by EFAS	133
Types of Commodities Used	135
Emergency Food Organizations	136
Chapter 7: Changes Over the Past 3 Years in EFAS Services and Possible Unmet Needs	144
Background	144
Data From the EFAS Provider Survey	146
Changes in Use of Services	147
Changes in the Supply of Food to EFAS Agencies	154
Possible Indicators of Unmet Needs	157
Capacity To Handle Future Changes in Demand	162
Chapter 8: Key Issues Related to the Emergency Food Assistance System	164
Variety Within the EFAS	164
Overall Size of the EFAS	165
Changes During the Past 3 Years in Emergency Food Needs	168
Program Coverage Issues	169
Adequacy of EFAS for Meeting the Current Demand	171
Providers' Ability To Meet Future Changes in Demand	173
Reflections on the Role of the EFAS in Relation to the Public Sector	173
References	177

Summary

Findings of the first comprehensive government study of the Emergency Food Assistance System (EFAS) suggest that public and private food assistance may work in tandem to provide more comprehensive food assistance than either could provide by itself. Five major types of organizations (emergency kitchens, food pantries, food banks, food rescue organizations, and emergency food organizations) operate in the EFAS. The study, which was sponsored by USDA's Economic Research Service, provides detailed information about the system's operations and about each of the five types of organizations. This report presents the study results in detail.

The EFAS helps ensure adequate nutrition for low-income Americans who may not have the resources to purchase sufficient food in stores and who may not be able to acquire enough through government programs. Throughout the country, thousands of emergency kitchens and food pantries provide year-round food assistance. Regional and national organizations, such as food banks and the food banks' national-level representatives, help the provider agencies obtain food and other resources necessary to accomplish their mission. The EFAS provides meals and food supplies that, for many recipients, complement existing government food assistance programs.

The study was conducted when the effects of the 1996 national welfare reform were becoming visible throughout the country. It affords an opportunity to examine how the EFAS is operating within the larger context of changes in America's low-income assistance policies and how the EFAS fits within the context of important government nutrition assistance programs. It updates past studies of the EFAS and extends them to provide a broader, more nationally representative view of the system. Additional information will be obtained in a survey of EFAS clients, planned for summer 2001.

Key findings:

- About 5,300 emergency kitchens and 32,700 food pantries participate in the EFAS. The kitchens provide more than 173 million meals. The pantries distribute an estimated 2.9 billion pounds of food annually, which translates into roughly 6.0 million meals per day or 2,200 million meals per year.
- Despite the substantial amounts of food distributed by the system, the EFAS remains much smaller in scale than the Federal programs that provide food assistance to the poor.
- The EFAS is mostly locally based. It is characterized by a wide variety of program structures and innovative practices that meet differing local needs and that make use of local resources and opportunities.
- Many direct service providers in the EFAS—65 percent of emergency kitchens and 67 percent of food pantries—are faith-based organizations.
- The EFAS extensively uses volunteers.

- During the 12 months before our survey, about 25 percent of kitchens and 33 percent of pantries turned away people who requested services, mostly because the individuals in question were disruptive, had substance abuse problems, or failed to meet residency requirements or income guidelines. Most kitchens and pantries did not turn away people because of lack of food.
- Although most kitchens and pantries do not turn away people because of lack of food, they do limit their food distribution. In about 40 percent of pantries, households are limited to receiving food once per month or less, and one-third of kitchens serve meals only one day per week.
- About one-fourth of both emergency kitchens and food pantries perceived that there are unmet needs for their services. More than half of food banks and food rescue organizations reported facing unmet needs.
- In contrast to the geographic distribution of the low-income population, emergency kitchens are disproportionately available in metropolitan (versus nonmetropolitan) settings. For example, only 15 percent of kitchens are located in nonmetropolitan areas, whereas 21 percent of America's poor population lives in these areas. Furthermore, kitchens in nonmetropolitan areas tend to serve fewer people compared with their metropolitan counterparts.
- The EFAS may not provide consistent coverage across parts of the day or days of the week.
- About 89 percent of kitchens and 87 percent of pantries believed they could deal with a 5-percent increase in the need for their services, and about one-third thought that they could deal effectively with as much as a 20-percent increase in need.